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**INFORMATION:**

Author’s credentials:

Iseki “is [an] Assistant Professor of Planning and Urban Studies School of Urban planning and Regional Studies at the University of New Orleans.”

Taylor “Is a Professor and Chair of Urban Planning and Director, UCLA Institute of Transportation Studies, at the University of California at Los Angeles.”

Scope and purpose of the work:

This is a report of a study conducted by the Iseki and Taylor, which looks to analyze user perceptions of transit stops and stations in Los Angeles. The study is meant to inform the reader what people think about bus stops and other transportation stations. This study also analyzes why certain factors may be more important to people.

Intended Audience:

The intended audience of this report is experts in the field of transportation. The study reports many statistical findings and utilizes lots of statistical terminology that the average person may not be familiar with.

**SUMMARY**

Thesis or main idea:

“most transit users would prefer short, predictable waits for buses and trains in a safe, if simple or even dreary, environment over long waits for late-running vehicles in even the most elaborate and attractive transit station, especially if they fear for their safety.” (Iseki, Taylor 39)

“In sum, we found that transit users tend to care more about personal safety and frequent, reliable service than the physical conditions of transit stops and stations. In other words, give a choice between benches, shelters, and off-street stations, or safe, frequent service; our findings suggest that most passengers will opt for the latter.” (Iseki, Taylor 40-41)

**EVIDENCE**

Summary of evidence:

* Typical transit trip
  + Walk to station, waiting for vehicle, riding vehicle, walking to final destination
  + People have always been more concerned about in-transit experience rather than the out-of-transit experience
* “As cities have grown more dispersed and auto-oriented, the out-of-vehicle time share of transit trips has increased.” (Iseki, Taylor 40)
* “In metropolitan areas with large transit systems, transit stops and stations are integral parts of the transit network, playing an important role in connecting multiple transportation modes and systems.” (Iseki, Taylor 40)
* Transit riders value out-of-vehicle time more than in-vehicle time
  + Time spent walking is time wasted
  + Various studies and numbers on page 41
* “Transit users’ relative valuation of out-of-vehicle time depends on a wide array of external factors, such as quality sinage and information at transit facilities, vehicle arrival time uncertainty, comfort, security, and safety,…weather, and crime frequency” (Iseki, Taylor 41)
* Ways to increase ridership
  + “time vis-à-vis in-vehicle travel times in the minds of travelers, improving travelers’ out-of-vehicle (walk, wait, and transfer) transit experiences is important to making public transit more attractive to users” (Iseki, Taylor 42)
* Past studies focus more on “quantity and quality of in-vehicle travel, probably because transit managers have more control over what happens on buses and trains than at stops and stations” (Iseki, Taylor 42)
* Transfer penalty
  + “represents generalized costs—including monetary costs, time, labor, discomfort, inconvenience, etc.” (Iseki, Taylor 43)
* Most important findings

1. “It’s easy to get around this station/stop”
2. “I usually have a short wait to catch my bus/train”
3. “It’s easy to find my stop or platform”
4. “This station is well lit at night”
5. “Having security guards here makes me feel safer”

* “Station amenities and cleanliness (public restrooms, food/drink sales, places to sit, shelter from sun/rain, and cleanliness” (Iseki, Taylor 52)

**EVALUATION**

Evaluation of research:

This study was thoroughly well-researched. The article goes into extensive details about how the survey was conducted, and how potential biases were eliminated. In order to provide background information the article provides a lot of well-researched background information.

 Evaluation of scope:

The background information that the article uses are various studies and reports focusing on public perceptions of mass transit. The article points out that lots of research has been done focusing on the in-transit time, but not much has been done to study the out-of-transit time. The article does cite these previous studies and uses them to support the findings of the study they conducted.

Evaluation of author bias:

This study is not biased. Through the use of good statistical procedures, the study diminishes most sources for potential bias.

**REFLECTION:**

I think that parts of this article are going to help me. I am unsure of how the statistical data will aid me, but I think that I could tie it in to analyzing Philadelphian rail stations and bus stations. It could serve as an inspiration for my hands on portion where I collect data. The background section of this article provided a lot of good statistical evidence that will help my project. More generalized data is good because I can use that in my literature review. Data specifically from Los Angeles will not help me in the same way. I think that ultimately this source will help lead to other studies done on the subject of transit. The studies mentioned will be a good place to start looking, as the topics they cover could really help aid my project.